

## REMARKS

By virtue of this amendment, claims 1, 3-11, and 13-24 are currently pending in this application. Claims 2 and 12 have been canceled without disclaimer or prejudice.

In an October 31, 2006 Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 12 and 22 for typographical errors. The applicants respectfully thank the Examiner for identifying the errors. Claim 12 has been canceled and claim 22 amended the claims as requested by the Examiner. The applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the object to the claims.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner rejected claim 1 because the recitation of “the association tool” lacked antecedent bases. The Examiner rejected claim 12 because the recitation of “advanced [passed] the association tool” was vague and indefinite. Regarding claim 1, the applicants have reorganized and redrafted portions of claim 1, but it is respectfully submitted that the scope of the same has not been narrowed. It is respectfully submitted that the antecedent bases issue identified by the examiner is now moot. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is respectfully requested. Regarding claim 12, the claim has been canceled making the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, moot. Moreover, claim 1 has been amended to include a recitation “the at least one electronic exhibit [is] automatically displayed as the electronic transcript and the synchronized media file are advanced passed the electronic link.” The applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that this indicates the exhibit is displayed as the exhibit is introduced in the media file. It is respectfully submitted that the vague and indefinite issue identified by the examiner are now moot in view of the amendment. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 13-16, 19-22, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent 5,392,428 (“Robins”). The Examiner rejected claims 5-12, 17, 18, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable and obvious over Robins in view of United States Published Patent

Application 2003/0078973 (“Przekop”). The applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

In particular, amended claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “inputting the user defined electronic link in the electronic transcript to establish the electronic link between the electronic transcript and the electronic exhibit; and applying the electronic link to the electronic transcript such that the electronic transcript and the at least one electronic exhibit are linked to cause the at least one electronic exhibit to automatically displayed as the electronic transcript and the synchronized media file are advanced passed the electronic link,” which is not shown by the references either alone or in any reasonable combination thereof. Specifically, both references are silent regarding automatically displaying the exhibit. As neither reference suggests or discloses automatically displaying the exhibit, they cannot anticipate or render obvious claim 1. For at least this reason, claim 1 is not anticipated or obvious in view of Robins or Przekop either alone or in any reasonable combination thereof.


Moreover, Robins specifically outlines a one-to-one or one-to-many relationship between a topic and a list of records. Robins provides no means to define a many-to-many relationship where one exhibit can be linked to many different transcripts and one transcript can be linked to many different exhibits. This deficiency is not cured by Przekop as Przekop specifically discloses only a one-to-one link between an electronic transcript textual file and an electronic transcript audio/video file. Thus, for at least this additional reason, amended claim 1 is patentably distinct from the references either alone or in any reasonable combination thereof.

Amended claim 15 has been amended to recite elements similar to amended claim 1 above and, based at least on this similarity, are patentably distinct from the references either alone or in any reasonable combination thereof. Claims 3-11, 13, 14, and 16-24 depend either directly or indirectly from claims 1 and 15 and, at least by virtue of the dependency, are patentably distinct from the references either alone or in any reasonable combination thereof.

Based on the foregoing, the applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the pending rejections and allow claims 1, 3-11, 13-24.

In the event any fee is due for entry of this reply, including a fee for an extension of time, is not otherwise accounted for, please charge such fee or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-2623.

January 29, 2007



---

Brian Kinnear, Reg. No. 43,717

HOLLAND & HART LLP

555 17<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 3200

Denver, Colorado 80201

Telephone: (303) 295-8170

Facsimile: (303) 295-8261